

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/749,752	AKIMOTO, TAIZO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeanine A Goldberg	1634	

All Participants:
Status of Application: After non-final.

 (1) Jeanine A Goldberg.

(3) _____.

 (2) Cameron Beddard.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 April 2004
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called for clarification regarding the amendment to Claim 8. The examiner did not know how the recitation changed the means for attaching. The examiner suggested that the means wfor attaching was taught in the specification to be a spotting device, an ink jet printer (page 6). The applicant indicated that this means encompassed a spotter. .